The Report Committee for Elizabeth Trippet Swann
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

The Grammar Teaching Toolbox:

A Resource for U.S. Secondary School Foreign Language Teachers

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Elaine K. Horwitz

Veronica G. Sardegna

The Grammar Teaching Toolbox:

A Resource for U.S. Secondary School Foreign Language Teachers

by

Elizabeth Trippet Swann, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2012

Abstract

The Grammar Teaching Toolbox:

A Resource for U.S. Secondary School Foreign Language Teachers

Elizabeth Trippet Swann, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Elaine K. Horwitz

This Report presents a variety of grammar teaching options for secondary school foreign language teachers in the U.S. Grammar teaching forms a large, and, in my opinion, important part of the foreign language curriculum in U.S. secondary schools. This Report presents grammar teaching methods in the form of a "grammar teaching toolbox" to encourage a variety-based teaching approach and allow teachers to enrich their pedagogical repertoires. All methods discussed in this Report involve explicit discussion of form and take place at the presentation or input/intake stage of grammar teaching. Sample lesson plans and helpful references for each methodology are presented. The first chapters of the Report present a discussion of the intended context, a brief history of grammar teaching, an analysis of the central issues in the debate over form-focused instruction and an outline for incorporating grammar into the contemporary communicative classroom.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Growing up in Texas, learning Spanish in my high school meant learning rules and applying them in written exercises of increasing complexity. After 5 years, I excelled in explicit knowledge and received the highest possible score on the Advanced Placement (AP) exam. However, my first weeks during a university study abroad session in Spain were a rude awakening to my lack of communicative skills. Some years later, my French classes in Europe involved high amounts of speaking and listening with no grammar instruction at all. I was constantly frustrated by how little autonomy this gave me in terms of choosing structures and verbs to use and by the discrepancy between my previous language learning experiences and the form of instruction I was receiving. Grammar instruction became a teaching choice of particular interest to me through these experiences.

Planning now to work as a Spanish teacher in the U.S. secondary school classroom, I wanted to focus on grammar teaching in my Master's Report. My original thought was to use the Report as a means of exploring the ongoing debate between advocates of a more naturalistic, acquisition-centered approach to language teaching (Krashen, 1985, is one representative example) and those who propose a more instructed, explicit approach (such as DeKeyser, 1995). However, I soon realized that I was not interested in debating the efficacy of form-focused instruction because, simply put, I already believe explicit grammar instruction to be a productive teaching tool.

I have clarified and tempered this belief through my accumulated experiences as a foreign language student, a foreign language teacher and a graduate student of Foreign Language Education. In Chapter One of this Report, I will discuss my personal philosophy of grammar teaching in the foreign language classroom after presenting a history of grammar teaching in the second language classroom and reviewing the pertinent theoretical issues. Chapter One will also define grammar

teaching for this Report, and discuss the context for foreign language teachers in the U.S., specifically the expectations for grammar teaching and the student population. My recent experiences teaching and observing in secondary school foreign language classrooms in the U.S. have made it clear that explicit grammar teaching is both expected and emphasized in this context.

As this context is the focus of this Report, I will not discuss the relative efficacy of explicit grammar teaching. Rather, I will accept form-focused teaching as a useful and important part of the foreign language classroom and focus on options for its implementation. In an effort to make this Report as practically valuable as possible for myself and other secondary school foreign language teachers in the U.S., these options are presented in the form of a grammar teaching toolbox.

Chapter Two will present the rationale for a "toolbox approach" to grammar teaching, as well as some important considerations for using the toolbox. Finally, Chapter Three will present the toolbox itself.

Chapter One: Grammar Teaching

In order to develop and skilled and informed approach to grammar teaching, it is important to be familiar with the history and theory behind grammar instruction in the field of second language teaching. The first section of this chapter presents a concise history of attitudes and approaches toward grammar teaching in the field. The second section defines and discusses *interface*, the central theoretical issue in debates about the efficacy of form-focused instruction, and the third section describes the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), a theory at the heart of contemporary conceptions of the role of grammar teaching in SLA. The chapter concludes with a personal statement of beliefs about grammar teaching and a definition of terms and context for this Report.

A Brief History of Grammar Teaching

Grammar teaching has a history of controversy in the field of second language teaching. In fact, second language acquisition and linguistics theories from the 1970s and 1980s caused a rejection of grammar teaching so pervasive that Alan Tonkyn (1994) divides the history of grammar in second language teaching into three phases: "The original supremacy of grammar," "The decline of grammar," and "The rediscovery of grammar." His categories provide a nice guiding framework for a historical overview.

The Original Supremacy of Grammar

The Grammar-Translation approach, in which the study of grammar was absolutely central and accuracy was heavily valued, characterized most of language teaching for centuries. In the 1960s, however, the behaviorist theories developed by psychologist B.F. Skinner proposed a new vision of human learning: habit formation. In response, the Audiolingual Method of language teaching gained popularity. In this approach, drills and repetition dominated the classroom. For Horwitz (2008), the Audiolingual Method, with its lack of explicit discussion of

form, was a movement away from grammar instruction. Yet Tonkyn (1994) notes that, though the Audiolingual Method may not have included explicit grammar teaching, "transmission of the grammatical system" was a guiding goal, with lessons sequenced according to grammatical complexity (p. 2).

Indeed, one of the major SLA theories that surfaced in the heyday of the Audiolingual Method was the very grammar-focused Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis proposed that negative interference and positive transfer between the learners' first and second language grammars were central to the language learning process, and that first language (L1) and second language (L2) differences should guide the focus of classroom drills. For teachers and for producers of teaching material, however, this hypothesis necessitated impractical amounts of comparative linguistic work and materials production, in addition to requiring a monolingual classroom, and it proved impractical.

In the 1970s, psychological theories of learning shifted to a cognitive-code, or information-processing, view of human learning. Under this influence, "language learning was viewed as hypothesis formation and rule acquisition, rather than habit formation. Grammar was considered important, and rules were presented" (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 460). This emphasis on grammar rules, however, would soon be called into question.

The Decline of Grammar

The decline of grammar in language teaching was the product of theoretical shifts in sociology, linguistics and SLA. Tonkyn (1994) points to the re-definition of language "competence" by sociologist Hymes, who coined the term "communicative competence" in 1972 and introduced a social dimension to the evaluation of language ability (p. 3). This new conceptualization of linguistic competence prompted the creation of functional/notional syllabi that focused on situational skills and task-centered competence. The methodology that emerged, and that remains

highly influential today, was called Communicative Language Teaching, and in it grammar was either completely excluded or peripheral (Horwitz, 2008).

First language acquisition theories from linguist Noam Chomsky were also influential in the anti-grammar movement. Specifically, Chomsky developed the idea that humans are born with a Language Acquisition Device, or LAD, that creates patterns and language from the available input and results in first language acquisition. Influenced by this work, Stephen Krashen (1985) developed the Input Hypothesis for second language learning. The Input Hypothesis proposed that language instruction was unnecessary; all that was needed for language acquisition were large amounts of comprehensible language input (speech and text) and a low affective filter to allow intake of the information. Working with Tracy Terrell, Krashen developed the Natural Approach, in which students were exposed to the target language with an almost exclusive focus on comprehension, and in which no grammar was taught.

The Rediscovery of Grammar

Current theories and methodologies have not only mitigated the strictly anti-instruction position proposed by Krashen but have also modified the anti-grammar stance of early Communicative Language Teaching. There is a renewed interest in grammar instruction in language teaching. Also, it is important to note that many language teachers never abandoned grammar teaching in the first place.

SLA theorists like McLaughlin (1987) and Schmidt (1990) questioned the validity of Krashen's distinction between language acquisition and language learning, proposing a complementary relationship between form-focused instruction and language acquisition. Cognitive psychology's skill acquisition theory presented a vision of language learning that allowed for explicit form-focused instruction. Studies showed the benefits of instruction for preventing the fossilization of errors that occurred in acquisition-rich immersion contexts (Harley 1992).

Into this more "form-friendly" atmosphere came Long's (1991) idea of Focus on Form – instruction that incorporated incidental, or even intentional, form-focused

instruction within a meaningful, communicative curriculum. Rutherford and Sharwood Smith (1988) proposed "consciousness-raising" in the classroom, a method in which teachers would deliberately draw learners' attention to grammatical forms in the target language input. Omaggio Hadley (2001) and ACTFL proposed Proficiency-Oriented Instruction, which includes grammar explanations and exercises in a communicative, student-centered classroom.

Although the anti-grammar era has, for the most part, passed, there is still no clear consensus as to how or to what extent grammar instruction should be included in the classroom. Informed by contemporary research, I explain in the fourth section of this Chapter why and how I believe that explicit, form-focused grammar instruction should be incorporated in the U.S. secondary school foreign language classroom.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION IN THE GRAMMAR DEBATE: INTERFACE

The efficacy of grammar instruction in increasing proficiency is still much debated. This section presents the various positions on one of the theoretical questions at the heart of the controversy over grammar teaching, the concept of *interface*. Interface is the exchange of information between explicit and implicit systems of knowledge, also referred to as controlled/automatic systems (McLaughlin, Rossman & McLeod, 1983), analyzed/automatic systems (Bialystok, 1981) and declarative/procedural systems (Bialystok & Bouchard Ryan, 1985). Knowledge held in the explicit system is state-able, while knowledge in the implicit system is unconsciously held. There is also a difference in the degree of fluency with which information in each system can be used, with use of implicit knowledge resulting in greater fluency of access to information and use of explicit knowledge resulting in less fluency.

Researchers and theorists debate the extent to which, if at all, information can move back and forth between those two systems. Positions in this debate can be usefully divided in three categories: non-interface, weak/indirect interface and

strong/direct interface (Hulstijn & de Graaf, 1994). A discussion of these three categories follows.

Non-Interface

Stephen Krashen (1985) is the central researcher proposing an absolute lack of communication between explicit and implicit systems of knowledge. For Krashen, implicit knowledge is the source of language proficiency. In claiming a fundamental difference between *acquiring* a language (gaining implicit knowledge) and *learning* a language (gaining explicit knowledge), he holds that explicit grammar instruction is unnecessary. Since movement from controlled to automatic knowledge is a recognized feature of learning in many subject areas, Krashen's idea implies that language learning is different than other forms of learning, an implication supported by Chomsky's LAD theory for first language acquisition.

Ellen Bialystok (1981) presents another version of the non-interface position. Under her framework, analyzed (explicit) and automatic (implicit) systems are completely distinct, yet may work simultaneously to produce linguistic proficiency. For Bialystok, the systems are of varying importance depending on what kind of task you need to carry out. The highest possible language proficiency (skilled, academic) involves high levels of both kinds of knowledge.

Weak/Indirect Interface

The weak/indirect interface position is most clearly expressed in the theories of Rod Ellis (2006), who presents the idea that knowledge held explicitly can be a facilitative tool in the development of implicit knowledge. In other words, explicit knowledge does not *become* implicit but rather aids the development of implicit knowledge "by priming a number of key acquisitional processes, in particular noticing" (Ellis, 2006, p. 97). He also holds that access to explicit knowledge can, in time, become fast enough for use in fluent communication, similar to Bialystok's "separate but useful" theory.

The "facilitative effect" described by Ellis is supported by other scholars. Ellis (2006) describes Lightbown's (1991) conceptualization that "grammar instruction

facilitates learning by providing learners with 'hooks' which they can grab on to…conscious understanding of how grammatical features work facilitates the kind of processing (e.g., attention to linguistic form) required for developing true competence" (Ellis, 2006, p. 90). VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) likewise view form-focused instruction as a means of improving learners' ability to acquire implicit information.

Strong/Direct Interface

The two most prominent researchers positing a strong/direct interface between implicit and explicit knowledge are Robert DeKeyser and Barry McLaughlin. In this vision of language learning, knowledge can move from the controlled to the automatic system.

There are two important theories from cognitive psychology that inform this position: skill acquisition theory and information-processing. Skill acquisition theory holds that skills become automatic through practice. Similarly, an information-processing vision of learning is one in which skills that initially take conscious effort, and occupy portions of working memory's finite space, can eventually move into long-term memory where they become part of our unconscious representations of knowledge, or schemata.

In viewing language acquisition through an information-processing lens, McLaughlin (McLaughlin et al., 1983) fundamentally disagrees with Krashen's non-interface position. Likewise, DeKeyser (1996) argues strongly for the benefit of practice and the concept of automatization of declarative knowledge. In fact, his position goes beyond the concept of direct interface: "It is now clear that there is a continuum of automaticity rather than an automatic-controlled dichotomy" (p. 350).

In the presentation stage, form-focused instruction typically contributes more to the development of explicit, declarative grammar knowledge. Thus, form-focused instruction assumes at least a weak/indirect, if not a strong/direct, interface between systems of explicit and implicit knowledge.

THE NOTICING HYPOTHESIS

In addition to ideas of a weak/indirect interface, a strong/direct interface and a continuum of automaticity, Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis has had such impact on the recent renewal of interest in form-focused instruction that it deserves mention here. Schmidt developed the hypothesis after his own experience learning Portuguese in Brazil. He kept a diary in Portuguese and noticed "a remarkable correspondence between my reports of what I had noticed when Brazilians talked to me and the linguistic forms I used myself…A search of the diary notes indicated that the forms that I produced were those that I noticed people saying to me" (p. 140).

Thus the Noticing Hypothesis, which proposes that second language acquisition stems from conscious noticing of forms, was born. For Schmidt, Krashen's emphasis on input fails to distinguish between input and *intake*, "that part of the input that the learner notices," or "subliminal learning" (Schmidt 1990, p. 139). The Noticing Hypothesis strongly supports form-focused instruction, which can help prime learners to notice forms in input and thereby subliminally learn them.

Swain (1998) expands on the definition of *noticing* by categorizing it on three levels: simple noticing due to frequency or importance, noticing a difference between L1 and L2 and learners noticing a gap in their interlanguage. All levels of noticing can be encouraged by grammar instruction and can prime learners for future enhancement of interlanguage.

THE WHY AND HOW OF GRAMMAR TEACHING IN THE CLASSROOM: A PERSONAL STATEMENT

Taking into account the history of grammar teaching and the theoretical positions discussed in the previous sections, this section presents my personal philosophy on incorporating grammar into the classroom, specifically into the classroom context defined in the next section.

I view grammar teaching as a useful tool for language learning when it is incorporated into a communicative classroom. In the communicative classroom,

class activities center around using the language in a meaningful way and are as student-centered as possible; class is about using the language, not learning *about* the language. For some learners, and I count myself among them, learning the grammar or "structure" of a language can speed up the development of a robust interlanguage. I like Lightbown's (1991) idea of grammar as helpful "hooks" that students can grab onto when processing language, and Thornbury's (1999) notion of grammar as "a way of tidying…meanings up…a resource, rather than an end in itself" (p. 25).

I do not think that all learners benefit equally from grammar instruction. Some more openness-oriented or holistic learners may not need or enjoy the kind of closure and abstraction that grammar instruction presents. That is why it is important to present grammar as an aid to meaning-making, as a means and not an end. This can allow some students to focus on a more holistic acquisitional approach and not feel too discouraged if the grammar rules are difficult for them.

Taking into account both the needs of less closure-oriented learners and the recommendations of current research, it is important to make sure the language class is "principally meaning-based, learner-centered, experiential, and contextualized" (Lightbown, 1990, p. 90). Class should include high amounts of language input (speech and text) and language output opportunities (speaking and writing) in small groups or pairs. The classroom should be rich with opportunities for students to experiment with and test their growing linguistic knowledge. Grammar instruction is a means to help them in that experimentation.

DEFINITIONS FOR THIS REPORT

This section provides two important definitions. First, the phrase "grammar teaching" will be defined for this Report. The next definition will examine the students and foreign language curriculum that provide the context for the intended users of the grammar teaching toolbox, secondary school foreign language teachers in the U.S. The discussion of the foreign language curriculum in this context will focus specifically on grammar teaching in the curriculum.

Grammar Teaching in This Report

In this Report, the phrase "grammar teaching" will be used interchangeably with "grammar instruction" and "form-focused instruction." In defining these terms, there are two important questions to consider: where this "grammar teaching" falls on the implicit-explicit continuum and what stages or steps in the grammar teaching process the toolbox is intended to facilitate.

For the purposes of this Report, "grammar teaching" denotes explicit discussion of form. This definition encompasses methods with varying degrees of overt instruction, that is to say, methods that range along a continuum of highly explicit teaching to somewhat more implicit explicit teaching. For example, some discussions of pedagogy label inductive grammar teaching as implicit grammar instruction. However, the intentional inductive grammar teaching discussed in this Report, which has grammar learning as at least one of its principal instructional foci and which leads to the statement of a rule, is merely a *more implicit method* of explicit grammar instruction (see DeKeyser, 1995, for a discussion of implicit and explicit inductive instruction). Additionally, certain methods with pointed grammatical objectives are too implicit to be considered in this paper. For example, teacher recasts of inaccurate grammatical utterances will not be defined here as a grammar teaching technique.

Traditional approaches to grammar teaching posit three stages in a grammar lesson: Present, Practice, Produce, or PPP (Byrne, 1986). More recent theories of instruction view grammar teaching as possible during any of the following stages: input, intake, acquisition, access and output (Richards, 2002). This Report and the methods contained in the toolbox focus on the presentation or input/intake stages of grammar teaching. This presentation stage can include initial introduction, re-introductions or reviews for further practice, and after-the-fact addressing of errors noticed by the teacher.

Practicing and producing (from Byrne's 1986 model), acquisition, access, and output (from Richard's 2002 model) and application (from Peck, 1989) are not the

primary foci of this Report, though they are certainly implied in any discussion of grammar teaching methods and some methods discussed here do integrate them. In other words, some discussion of grammar practice will be included as it arises naturally from discussion of presentation techniques. It is also important to note that feedback, error correction and evaluation, important aspects of grammar teaching, are beyond the scope of this Report.

Students and Curriculum:
The Context for Secondary School Foreign Language Teachers in the U.S.

This Report is written with a very specific audience in mind: secondary school foreign language teachers in the U.S. It is therefore important to discuss some of the relevant characteristics and constraints of the context in which those teachers operate.

The majority of students in this context, though certainly not all of them, are native speakers of English. They have experience with formal schooling and have, therefore, a certain level of literacy and study skills. They are old enough that abstract thinking, the stage of cognitive development in which comprehension of abstract systems such as grammar rules becomes possible, can be assumed. Classes are not usually intensive, but rather range from three to five meetings of forty-five minutes to an hour and a half per week.

The curriculum in this context stems from several important influences, ranging from national educational standards to direction from a school's foreign language department. The two influences discussed here are the National Standards for Foreign Language Education produced by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and textbooks (with accompanying materials) selected by a teacher's school or district. Though the Standards neither encourage nor mention grammar instruction, most current textbooks assign it an important role in a curriculum designed to achieve ACTFL's Standards.

The ACFTL Standards are the guiding vision for the foreign language teaching profession in the U.S., as decided by a national group of language teachers

and program administrators. They are extremely communicative and cultural in focus. They are divided into 5 categories: Communication, communicating in languages other than English; Cultures, gaining knowledge and understanding of other cultures; Connections, connecting with other disciplines; Comparisons, developing insight into the nature of language and culture; and Communities, participating in multilingual communities at home and around the world (ACTFL website).

Current textbooks focus on culture and communication in accordance with ACTFL Standards, but assign a clear role to grammar in achieving linguistic proficiency. *¡Expresate!* is a Spanish textbook currently in wide use in private and public secondary schools in the U.S. (Humbach, Velasco, & Chiquito, 2006). Examining the table of contents page for chapter six shows a curriculum guided by a cultural (Mexico), communicative (how to order in restaurants), and thematic (food) framework (p. xi). This framework is in keeping with ACTFL's Standards. Within this framework, however, the grammar points covered in the chapter, clearly delineated in the table of contents under the headings *Gramática en acción 1* and *Gramática en acción 2*, are an explicit, important category.

Likewise, *¡Buen Viaje!* (McGraw-Hill, 2007), another commonly used secondary school Spanish textbook, emphasizes grammar teaching. To take an example from the Level 1 textbook, the grammar or "*estructura*" section on page 113 shows that the grammar is contextualized – in this case At School (*"En la escuela"*) – and follows a traditional PPP format that ends in a communicative activity. In other words, the grammar form is presented in context, then practiced in a guided exercise, and finally used in a personalized, group work activity. The quizzes and tests that accompany both these textbooks emphasize grammatical accuracy.

Thus, U.S. secondary school foreign language instructors teach in a context in which students are capable of learning grammar and in which instructional materials both encourage and expect grammar teaching as a means of achieving national language standards.

Chapter Two: A Toolbox Approach to Grammar Teaching

Before presenting the grammar teaching toolbox, this chapter explains the rationale behind a "toolbox approach" to grammar teaching and presents the reader with a few important points to remember when using the toolbox's methods.

Rationale for a Toolbox Approach

The grammar teaching toolbox is a collection of pedagogical ideas for presenting grammar concepts. Its purpose is to help teachers increase the variety of their approach to grammar teaching and to avoid an overreliance on traditional, deductive rule "telling." It is a resource for the creation of an intelligent and effective variety-based approach to teaching grammar.

As Borg (1998b) notes, teachers create their own "maps" for how best to incorporate grammar into their classrooms (p. 10). A toolbox approach allows teachers to increase the richness of these maps by experimenting with new methods and adding variety to the classroom to peak student interest, increase motivation and cater to diverse learning styles. The list of methods presented here is not intended to be a list of "best practices." It is a gathering of ideas from SLA literature, teaching methodology books and my own experiences and observations in the classroom for consideration, adaptation, and reflective use.

Considerations for a Toolbox Approach to Grammar Teaching

1. **Different methods work better for different learning styles**. For example, more analytic students may respond best to deductive teaching, while more holistic learners may prefer inductive teaching (Celce-Murcia, 1991).
2. **Learner beliefs will influence students' receptivity to new approaches to language learning**. Explicitly acknowledging learner resistance to new methods for learning grammar and connecting the methods "to successful outcomes so that

students can see clearly how they lead to successful learning" can be an important supplement to methodological variety (Rivera-Mills & Plonsky, 2007, p. 544).

3. **Teachers should strike a balance between reliability and simplicity in presenting grammar rules to students** (Hulstjin & de Graaf, 1994). Also, some methods may be better suited to complex rules and some others to simple rules.

4. **Whether or not teachers should use the learners' native language (L1) when teaching grammar is still a matter of debate**. The "anti-L1 attitudes" (Scott & de la Fuente, 2008, p. 100) stemming from theories that propose an acquisition approach have recently been criticized by researchers like Cook (2001), who calls L1 "a useful element in creating authentic L2 users" (p. 402). A balance should be struck between "treating the L1 as a classroom resource" (Cook, 2001, p. 402) and the fact that "the teacher is, generally, the primary source of target language input and is therefore responsible for maximizing its use in the classroom" (Scott & de la Fuente, 2008, p. 100).

5. **The pedagogical ideas in the grammar teaching toolbox have substantial overlap**. For example, teaching grammar through video can be inductive, input-processing usually involves deductive teaching, and metalinguistic terminology can be used during discussion of form in any approach.

6. **Methodology choice should be thoughtful**. Thornbury (1999) suggests some "rules of thumb" for deciding how to teach grammar including: The Rule of Economy– "Economiz[e] on presentation time in order to provide maximum practice time" (p. 153); The Rule of Use– Grammar should "facilitate the learners' comprehension and production of real language" (p. 153); and The Rule of Context– Grammar should be taught with meaning in mind, not as abstract forms. Never say, 'Today we're going to learn the past perfect' (p. 153). Thornbury also suggests that teachers evaluate the efficacy of a methodology by examining the *attention* it garners from learners (specifically, attention to the grammatical point, not to extraneous factors), the *understanding* caused, which can be determined by the "amount and

quality of contextual information, explanation and checking," the *memory* it creates and the *motivation* triggered (p. 26).

Chapter Three: The Toolbox

This toolbox presents eleven pedagogical options for teaching grammar:

1. Deductive Grammar Teaching
2. Inductive Grammar Teaching
3. Processing Instruction
4. L1-L2 Comparisons
5. Input Enhancement
6. Metalinguistic Terminology
7. Task-Based Grammar Teaching
8. Student/Peer Teaching
9. Using YouTube Videos and Other Internet Resources for Grammar Self-Teaching/Self-Study
10. Using Texts to Teach Grammar
11. Using Movies, Television and Other Video Clips to Teach Grammar

Each method is introduced with a general summary that provides a definition and a description of characteristic activities. Then the benefits and limitations of each method are listed, with the hope that a balanced consideration of the pros and cons will help teachers to incorporate them more productively and thoughtfully into their teaching repertoire. Finally, the "Examples" subsection within each section points teachers to helpful sample lesson plans and supplemental teaching materials.

1. DEDUCTIVE GRAMMAR TEACHING

Summary: Deductive Grammar Teaching is instruction in which students are presented with a rule first. In other words, it is top-down grammar teaching that moves from a general rule to specific language instances. Rule presentation can be followed by practice (output) or examples (input). The deductive teaching process has been conceptualized as PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production) by Byrne (1986) and as presentation followed by practice that follows an MMC progression

(Mechancial, Meaningful, Communicative) by Paulston (1972, as cited in DeKeyser, 1998). VanPatten's (1996) Input Processing approach, discussed later in this chapter, is also an example of deductive teaching.

Benefits: This type of grammar instruction allows grammar rules to be presented quite clearly. Deductive teaching can also be easier on the teacher, as it requires less intricate advance preparation. Thornbury (1999) points out that it can also be an effective method for dealing with issues that arise incidentally during class and for which the teacher has not prepared. In addition, many students will be familiar with this method of grammar teaching. By aligning well with student expectations and beliefs about language learning, deductive teaching may lead to a smoother learning experience (Rivera-Mills & Plonsky, 2007).

Limitations: Deductive teaching often fails to be student-centered or experiential, key aspects of communicative language teaching. Teacher-fronted presentation of material can lead to less student engagement and lower levels of intake. In addition, Thornbury (1999) notes that deductive teaching can "encourag[e] the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rules" (p. 47).

Examples: In his book *How to Teach Grammar*, Scott Thornbury provides some nice examples of deductive grammar lessons. In particular, the two lessons on pages 41-47 are interesting in their rejection of a teacher-fronted deductive lesson.

In the first lesson, Thornbury gives groups of students a written rule with a short gap-fill exercise in which to apply it. Each group has a rule that illuminates a different aspect of the form being studied, and are soon re-grouped to share their information and check to see if the exercise answers need any revision. It is an information gap, or jigsaw, activity about grammar.

In the second lesson, students are given grammar "self-study" homework, which allows for students to gain exposure and practice with a grammar rule outside

of class time. Thornbury points to the efficiency of this approach, which allows teachers to maximize class time for input and output practice (see Thornbury's Rule of Economy in the previous chapter).

2. INDUCTIVE GRAMMAR TEACHING

Summary: Inductive Grammar Teaching is the opposite of Deductive Grammar Teaching. It is bottom-up grammar teaching that moves from examples to rules. As Shaffer (1989) defines it, inductive teaching is instruction in which "student attention is focused on grammatical structures used in context so that students can consciously perceive the underlying patterns…and then verbalize [them]" (p. 395-6). Shaffer's emphasis on verbalizing the underlying rule is notable here. As discussed in the introduction to this Report, DeKeyser (1995) identifies an implicit-explicit continuum of inductive teaching and this section will focus on the explicit end.

Within explicit inductive teaching practices, Herron and Tomasello (1992) point to two distinct options: teacher-fronted, learner-passive induction, in which the teacher gives examples and then states the rule, and learner-active, teacher-guided induction, in which the teacher provides students with language examples to work with individually or in groups and the students state the rule on their own. As a general model, Sysoyev (1999) outlines an EEE pattern for inductive grammar lessons: Exploration, in which examples are examined, Explanation, in which grammar patterns or rules are stated, and Expression, in which students then use the new grammar in a language production activity.

Sysoyev (1999) points out that inductive teaching draws in interesting ways on both Vgotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development and Krashen's idea of *i*+1 input for learners. Both these concepts suggest that learners learn from situations in which the language is just beyond their comprehension and in which they must push themselves to increase their proficiency. In inductive teaching, students interact with material that is comprehensible yet calculated to include an appropriately challenging, previously unexamined grammatical form. Though this

similarity to Krashen's *i*+1 theory has led many researchers to equate inductive learning with implicit learning, inductive learning can be a valuable tool for explicit form-focused instruction.

Benefits: An inductive path to grammar rule formation can be motivating and engaging for students. A student-centered approach, in which the students engage in groups or pairs with the examples and formulate the rules without direct assistance from the teacher, is especially in line with communicative theories of language learning and the current "discovery learning" trend in educational theory (Thornbury, 1999). In addition, students in higher level classes can get target language practice during the induction task (Ellis, 1998). Shaffer (1989) points out that inductive teaching allows students to formulate rules in a way that makes sense to them and are "more likely to fit into their existing mental structures" (Thornbury, 1999, p. 54). Larsen-Freeman (2003) also points to the benefits to student confidence and autonomy that can result from practice with interpreting the language on their own.

Limitations: One of the main limitations to inductive teaching is the amount of time and careful planning required to create successful inductive lessons, especially if authentic materials are used for the language samples. The teacher must find material comprehensible enough that focus on meaning does not interfere with focus on form. The material must also include the new grammar with enough frequency and in enough variations that the relevant forms and form-meaning links can be discerned by students. Another limitation is the amount of in-class time an inductive grammar lesson can require. Waiting for students to deduce rules takes longer than simply telling them the rule. The formulation of faulty rules is also a risk in inductive teaching, and one that must be considered in both selection of materials and in planning for the rule presentation or discussion stage of the lesson.

There is debate in the research as to whether inductive teaching is best limited to simple structures or whether it can include more complex rules, and this question is as yet unresolved. It is important, therefore, that teachers carefully consider the feasibility of induction *for the specific form they are teaching* and that they critically evaluate the success or failure of inductive lessons in this light. Most researchers also worry about the effectiveness of inductive learning for weaker students, though Shaffer (1989) suggests that they are perhaps the very students who can benefit most from formulating rules in their own words rather than relying on explanations that may not work for them.

Finally, and importantly, the student-centered nature of inductive teaching may run contrary to many students' beliefs about language learning. The frustration that is often experienced during the exploration or examples phase of the lesson can be very negative for students. Both Thornbury (1999) and Rivera-Mills and Plonsky (2007) point to the importance of familiarizing learners with this type of activity, explicitly addressing their resistance and reflecting with them on the successes and benefits they experience as a result of inductive lessons.

Examples: Many of the sections below present examples of inductive teaching, most notably "Using Texts to Teach Grammar" and "Using Movies, Television and Other Video Clips to Teach Grammar." Thornbury (1999) also points out the TPR (Total Physical Response) instruction can be a form of kinesthetic inductive teaching if some discussion of forms used follows a TPR session.

3. PROCESSING INSTRUCTION

Summary: Processing instruction, also called input processing instruction, was developed by Bill VanPatten and Teresa Cardierno (VanPatten 1996; VanPatten and Cardierno, 1993). Its basic premise is that learner intake of grammatical forms will be improved by concentrated, explicit focus on the mechanisms of processing that learners use to interpret new material. According to VanPatten (1996), learners are

hardwired to interpret linguistic information according to the patterns and parameters of their first language. In processing instruction, teachers raise student awareness of the differences between a grammatical aspect of their first language and the target language, and explicitly advise them of the processing strategies that they will need to change in interaction with this feature. As conceptualized by VanPatten and Sanz (1995), the goal of processing instruction is not necessarily the acquisition of a particular grammar rule, but rather to "provide the internal learning mechanisms with richer grammatical intake" as a result of strategic awareness of processing mechanisms (p. 169).

As described by VanPatten (1996), a processing instruction lesson has three steps: 1) The grammar point is explained, much like traditional, deductive grammar teaching; 2) The appropriate processing strategies for the grammar point are discussed; and 3) Students interact with target language input in a structured input, or practice, phase. In Step 3, students are not required to produce language. Rather they complete a series of meaningful, written tasks in which they choose between two alternatives, order or rank sentences, match, or make the choice between binary options like true/false or logical/illogical (Guilloteau, 2009-2012). The exercises are designed to bring learners over and over to a point of decision that hinges on the area of processing difference under scrutiny. Further criteria for the design of structured input materials will not be discussed here, but can be found in detail in VanPatten (1996).

Benefits: The explanation step of processing instruction shares many of the benefits inherent in traditional, deductive grammar instruction, such as clarity and alignment with many learners' beliefs. In addition, processing instruction provides students with the opportunity to see many examples of a target form before producing it, which Lee and VanPatten (2003) believe is crucial in the formation of learner interlanguage. Processing instruction is meaning-focused and also seeks to increase learner autonomy and strategic knowledge.

Limitations: Perhaps the most obvious limitation is the level of contrastive analysis required by input processing instruction, though foreign language teachers in the U.S. may often have the kind of monolingual classroom required. Also, the nature of input processing requires a very narrow focus on one specific grammatical form. VanPatten (1996) even suggests that the focus be so narrow that the *él/ella* verb forms are focused on before the *yo* forms in Spanish instruction (p. 173). Spending class time on such limited grammar points may not always be feasible. In addition, the written nature of the structured input tasks may exclude student interaction and communication. (Though it should be mentioned that such tasks could make excellent homework assignments).

The creation of structured input materials is quite time-consuming and complex for those teachers without access to such materials for their target language. VanPatten (1996) also points to the difficulty of creating meaningful structured input activities for grammar points that are not meaning-based (for example, adverb placement) (p. 150).

Examples: VanPatten's 1996 book *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction* is a good source of lesson plan examples and sample materials (see pages 71-81). In addition, the University of Texas' COERLL Foreign Language Teaching Methods website presents an extremely informative overview of structured input activities, including sample materials for French, videotaped teacher discussions of the methodology and processing instruction lessons. The page can be found at the link below: http://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/vocabulary/04/input.php

4. L1/L2 Comparisons

Summary: Another option for grammar instruction is overt comparison of L1 and L2 grammatical features. The comparisons can be the main teaching method used to present a grammar topic, as in, for example, the first phase of an input processing

lesson, or they can be a supplemental aid to form-focus within a larger grammar lesson, as in the final stages of an inductive grammar lesson.

During the "decline of grammar," crosslingual comparisons were "an anathema" (Borg, 1998a, p. 171). In particular, the failure of contrastive analysis and the emphasis on immersion/acquisition approaches to language learning made such comparisons seem ineffective at best and harmful at worst. Yet current research supports their use, seeing L1/L2 comparisons as "a useful tool to support and increase…learning" (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003, p. 760) and as fundamentally different than traditional contrastive analysis by virtue of their inclusion "within communicative practice" (Ammar, Lightbown & Spada, 2010, p. 130).

Benefits: Ammar et al. (2010) note that crosslingual comparisons can help address many interlanguage issues resulting from differences between the L1 and the L2. These issues include L2 grammatical features that are not incorporated or are avoided in production and errors caused by an assumption of *complete* similarity between two languages that are *somewhat* similar. Teacher knowledge of L1/L2 differences can be an invaluable resource for understanding the source of learner errors (Leech, 1994). Awareness of L1/L2 differences can be a revelatory tool that "unlock[s] the…learner's mind" (James, 1994, p. 212), an "eye-opener" (Borg, 1998a, p. 18). In addition, the ACTFL guidelines explicitly encourage that "students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own" (ACTFL website).

Limitations: Crosslingual comparisons assume a classroom that shares the same L1 (in the case of this context, English). If this is not the case, the comparisons may alienate some students and have negative affective repercussions in addition to having no educative effect. The L2 being studied may also be so dissimilar from English that comparisons are not helpful. Even when the L1 and L2 are similar, not all grammatical features allow for effective comparison (such as the subjunctive tense

in Spanish). Encouraging a comparison approach to language learning can be detrimental to the acquisition of features that cannot be approached in this way. Also, students' knowledge of linguistic features in their native language is not always strong, and crosslingual comparisons may entail just as much L1 focus as they do L2.

Examples: Olivia & Hill publishers produces a series of books for teachers interested in crosslingual comparisons. Each book is titled *English Grammar for Students of* _____ and they are available for most languages. As the title indicates, these books include a strong focus on L1 grammar concurrently with L2. The chapters are short and simple, easy for photocopying and distribution or simply for refreshing the teacher's knowledge of L1/L2 differences before he or she discusses it in the classroom.

5. INPUT ENHANCEMENT

Summary: Input enhancement in grammar instruction is a simple concept. Teachers can use italics, color-coding, bold-facing, underlining or other techniques to draw learner attention to specific forms in a text. This causes learners to notice the forms, and, as Sharwood Smith (1993) states, noticing is the end goal of input enhancement, which "make[s] no further assumptions about the consequences of that input on the learner" (p. 176). Therefore, in its purest definition, input enhancement can be part of implicit or explicit teaching techniques (Sharwood Smith, 1991). The idea of input enhancement is closely tied to the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) and the theory of consciousness-raising in form-focused instruction (Rutherford, 1987; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1988). Input enhancement can be positive, enhancing correct forms, or negative, highlighting incorrect forms.

Benefits: Input enhancement can be a useful aid in inductive or deductive teaching activities. It can help learners who have trouble seeing patterns in input on their

own. It can draw attention to non-salient forms that would otherwise go unnoticed. In addition, input enhancement invokes an active mental response from students, providing a cue that engages them in thinking about the reason for the enhancement. It does not provide them with an easy answer, but is rather an impetus for processing engagement.

Limitations: The main limitation of input enhancement is its inauthenticity. In authentic or meaningful texts, enhancements can make students disengage from meaning and disbelieve authenticity. Also, enhancing input means putting your students in contact with language in a way that does not occur in the real world; they are not getting practice with real language interactions.

Examples: Enhanced input is very common, and can be found in most foreign language textbooks. The sample lesson reproduced in Appendix A, in which the grammar under examination is bolded, presents an example of enhanced input.

6. METALINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGY

Summary: When teachers not only talk about the language (metalanguage) but also use the technical grammatical terms for various forms (for example, *gerund* or *past progressive*) they are using metalinguistic terminology.

Benefits: Borg's (1999) qualitative examination of the thought processes behind four teachers' choices to use or not use metalinguistic terminology articulates many of its benefits. Grammar terms can provide a useful "shorthand" for teachers and students to share, allowing students to pinpoint the areas in which they need help and teachers to make easy connections and references. One teacher notes that some metalinguistic descriptions can help students categorize information efficiently when linked to a visual image, like conjugation charts and verb lists (p. 104). Another

teacher points to the autonomy that terminological knowledge can give students by allowing them to consult grammar reference books (p. 103-4).

Limitations: Many students do not know the metalinguistic terms for grammar in their native language. This can result in a large learning curve and in some anxiety. One of the teachers in Borg's (1999) study notes that terminology is often intimidating for students. Teachers must weigh the benefits of metalinguistic shorthand against potential negative reactions and strive to be responsive to the learners' attitudes toward the use of grammar terms. If terminology seems extraneous, it may be best avoided. Also, focusing on metalinguistic terms can detract from a focus on communicative language use. When too much focus is on terminology, the class can begin to be about 'learning *about* the language' and not about '*using* the language.'

Examples: Borg's (1999) study includes the transcripts of various classes in which teachers used, avoided, or used then discarded metalinguistic terminology during their foreign language classes. To brush up on metalinguistic terminology, both the Olivia & Hill book series mentioned in the previous section and grammar reference books are helpful resources.

7. TASK-BASED GRAMMAR TEACHING

Summary: Before discussing the use of tasks to teach grammar, a general definition of task-based teaching is helpful. Skehan (1998) defines task-based teaching as engaging students in a real-world activity with a concrete, measurable outcome or product and in which meaning is the principal focus. Huang (2010) notes that tasks usually consist of pair or group work. Huang presents Willis' (1996) model for task-based activities as a model well-suited to tasks that include grammar instruction. This model includes three stages: (a) Pre-task– instructions, presentation of key vocabulary or linguistic features, possible modeling; (b) Task– completing the task,

planning to present it, presenting it to the class; (c) Post-task– analysis of linguistic forms used in the task.

In discussing the incorporation of form-focused instruction into the meaning-focused framework of task-based teaching, Celce-Murcia (1991) points out that all tasks require both "top-down" skills, such as understanding the content and task organization, and "bottom-up" skills involving proper vocabulary and grammar structures needed for completing the task (p. 476). Grammar instruction, a focus on the bottom-up skills, can be included before, during or after the task (Richards, 2002). Form-focused instruction before the task can include a review or presentation of grammar that will be used in the task and some examples or practice with the forms. During the task, grammar instruction can be provided as students struggle to express themselves. After the task, teachers can provide a concluding focus on the forms used during the task, potentially springboarding into further practice with those forms.

Although meaning is the focus of task-based learning, teachers can use tasks to address specific grammar points by selecting tasks that focus on a particular grammar point rather than selecting a task and teaching the grammar necessitated by the activity. Ideally, the task is structured so that "production of the target structure is essential to complete the task" (Loschky & Bley-Vroman, 1990, as cited in Fotos, 1994). In other words, use of the target form should arise naturally from the task. Fotos and Ellis (1991) even propose creating tasks about grammar, in which learning about a grammatical form is the task, performed communicatively. This type of task, however, is very similar to an inductive grammar lesson and seems far removed from the real-world, product-oriented nature of most task-based teaching.

Benefits: The communicative, meaning-focused nature of task-based grammar teaching helps students view grammar as a tool for using the language, rather than an end in itself. Also, many tasks can be intrinsically motivating (Huang, 2010). The pair or group work involved in task-based teaching allows students all the affective

and linguistic benefits that spring from collaboration and language experimentation in more intimate settings.

Limitations: One problem with task-based instruction in this age group and monolingual context, especially in lower levels, is the use of L1 between students during task completion. Teachers must balance the motivational and linguistic benefits of the task with the potential use of L1 during a large portion of classtime. Also, it can be difficult to create or find tasks that naturally elicit use of a specific target feature. It is likely that task-based instruction is not appropriate for some grammar topics.

Examples: Huang (2010) provides two good examples of task-based grammar instruction on pages 35 and 36 of her article on task-based grammar teaching for ESL students. The lessons are divided into three sections: pre-task, task cycle and language focus and could be easily adapted to a foreign language classroom.

8. STUDENTS/PEERS AS GRAMMAR TEACHERS

Summary: Another interesting idea is to create an intergrade student teaching program within a foreign language department. Older, successful learners can be invited to teach a grammar lesson to the class. Some teacher oversight in lesson planning, materials development and general teaching guidelines is of course needed, as is a selection process that ensures the quality of student teachers.

Benefits: Seeing learners close to their age who have succeeded with the language can be motivating for students. Celani (1979) cites the motivational benefits of student teaching for both the student teachers and the students being taught. Having a "new teacher" can also be a fun change of dynamic in the classroom.

Limitations: Scheduling students to teach may be difficult. Additionally, if firm and fair criteria for the selection of student teachers are not in place, the program could allow for teacher favoritism and be de-motivating for students not chosen to be teachers. Also, student teachers may not be able to field questions adequately during presentation without teacher assistance.

Examples: I first saw this idea in action at a secondary school in Austin, Texas. The middle school Spanish teacher had allowed one especially enthusiastic high school student to introduce the past tenses of Spanish (preterit and imperfect) to her eighth grade class. No official program was in place, but from time to time an older student who remained in contact with this teacher expressed interest in teaching a class and was allowed to do so.

Though the program described in Celani (1979) is a small-group tutoring program, not a whole class student-led grammar lesson, its description is still applicable for teachers who want to create such a program at their schools. Especially relevant is Celani's description of the competitive, prestigious nature of the student teaching program. Creating a prestigious program made student teaching a motivational force in the language studies of her older students, though I would caution that too high a level of competition may make the program de-motivating or negative for students who are not chosen.

9. USING YOUTUBE VIDEOS OR OTHER INTERNET RESOURCES FOR GRAMMAR SELF-TEACHING/SELF-STUDY

Summary: The Internet is filled with videos of teachers teaching grammar and websites with helpful grammar explanations. The videos provide an especially interesting deviation from self-teaching or reviewing using textbooks, grammar reference books and class notes. Amateur YouTube videos, teacher blogs with video series and websites of commercial language programs all provide teachers and students with videos explaining grammar points. The quality of instructional

method, the video quality, the production values, and the depth of information covered vary widely. Some teachers seem to be selling themselves or a particular language institute, while others are producing videos for their students' personal use.

In the classroom, it is hard to imagine that these videos could ever be used in place of an in-person teacher-guided/facilitated activity. Teachers could, however, use these videos as in-class supplements. Perhaps the best use I can see for such videos is as a resource for students to use in self-study or self-teaching. One easy way to create such a resource would be to gather links to various videos and Internet websites explaining grammar points on a class Wiki or website.

Benefits: Having the opportunity to see a variety of explanations by a variety of teacher types can help "individualize learning" for students (Hall, 1998, p. 6). Students can search until they find a video or explanation that makes sense to them. The idea of watching a video in which a grammar point is explained and demonstrated can be especially attractive to students in comparison poring over a grammar reference book or pages of notes for review or clarification. Using these Internet resources can be a form of learner autonomy. In class, a video can provide a nice change of pace.

Limitations: The quality of teaching can be extremely low in videos found online. Many of them present a grammar-translation or audiolingual approach to learning grammar that may work against a teacher's attempt to create a communicative, meaningful approach to language learning. Also, some videos are incredibly boring. Watching the language treated in such a dull, dry manner could potentially be very de-motivating.

If a teacher makes links to grammar videos available to students, he or she is tacitly endorsing the language pedagogy or treatment found in the video. It is therefore important to select videos with a critical eye. This is not to say that dry, grammar-translation approach videos might not provide a useful review for students,

but some are simply too poorly done to be beneficial. To address these issues, it could be a good idea for teachers to briefly discuss the limitations of the videos with students, raising their critical awareness of the materials they use online and encouraging students to use the resources as needed for review or clarification but not to feel bad if a video does not help them or seems uninteresting. Any negative effects of the videos, such as boredom and de-motivation, could be mitigated by encouraging a more critical approach. In addition, this could help increase learner autonomy in using videos selected by the teacher and in any future Internet self-study.

Examples: The website spanishdict.com produces Spanish grammar teaching videos that are clear, easy to follow, include visual aids and have high production values. They are a bit slow, but could be very useful for review and clarification. The web address below links to a lesson that covers usage rules, forms and examples for *ser* and *estar* in Spanish:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A0o5FK3TZCs
Señor Wooly produces fun musical videos about Spanish on his website, www.senorwolly.com. (To view some videos an annual membership fee is necessary). His videos often deal more with communicative situations and vocabulary sets, but he does produce some grammar videos. For example, his video "Hacer-Pretérito" presents a verb conjugation with music and could be a good in-class supplement for learning that irregular preterit construction:
http://www.senorwooly.com/video_indiv.php?cancion=hacer_preterito
On YouTube, a Spanish woman posts teaching videos under the user name "The Spanish Blog." These videos are always some of the first to appear in a search for Spanish grammar terms on YouTube. I cite these videos as a negative example, videos that should be used neither as in-class supplements nor self-study materials. The lessons are dull, slow, have very low production values, are poorly structured and have no visual aids. This is her presentation of *ser* and *estar:*

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mw0fYr0s02Y&feature=relmfu

10. USING TEXTS TO TEACH GRAMMAR

Summary: Presenting grammar through texts is essentially an inductive teaching methodology. Both Paesani (2005) and Thornbury (1999) envision grammar teaching with texts as both a form of grammar presentation and a model or springboard for written or oral grammar practice. Teachers select texts that include the target form and students discover the underlying grammar pattern or rule through engaging with the texts. The reading tasks should move from a focus on content and meaning to a focus on form (Thornbury, 1999). In other words, the teacher should keep basic reading instruction methodology in mind. As Paesani (2005) notes, this means including top-down instruction, such as schema activation and predicting before reading, bottom-up instruction, such as tasks to guide readings and teaching of key vocabulary, and postreading tasks that summarize and personalize the material (p. 18).

Paesani (2005) proposes a methodology that incorporates the steps for inductive lessons and reading tasks. The meaning-focused pre-reading phase and reading tasks (gist and detailed) correspond to the input of examples that begins inductive lessons. The decoding of grammar examples from the text, either in student groups or as a teacher-led activity, corresponds to the same phase of inductive teaching. Finally, the postreading discussion of form corresponds to the rule statement that ends an inductive presentation of grammar.

The term "texts" encompasses authentic and contrived materials, including literature, articles, blogs, advertisements, song lyrics, excerpts from textbooks and even transcripts of dialogue. Text selection is critical, and Paesani (2005) suggests the following criteria: familiar content, a sequential narrative style, a balance of familiar and unknown words, high frequency vocabulary, and repeated use of the target grammar structure.

Benefits: Teaching grammar through texts has many benefits. It incorporates grammar instruction with reading skill practice, vocabulary growth, and, potentially, cultural enrichment. It can have the same beneficial effects described in the section on inductive teaching, including increased autonomy, confidence, and pattern recognition. It uses meaningful, contextualized language. Also, the texts can be fun and motivating for students, especially if the teacher is able to personalize the text selection to reflect the interests of the class.

Limitations: Text selection can be problematic. Authentic texts may be too difficult and include too much unknown vocabulary. Classes may have a wide variety of interests and choosing texts that engage all students may be difficult. Also, as Thornbury (1999) points out, "students who want quick answers to simple questions may consider the use of texts to be the 'scenic route' to language awareness, and would prefer a quicker, more direct route, instead" (p. 90). Thus, previous discussions of the importance of addressing learner beliefs may be applicable in this context as well.

Examples: Thornbury (1999) provides several sample lesson plans for teaching grammar through texts. His Lessons 1 and 2 on pages 73-79 present good examples of teaching from dialogue scripts and authentic articles, respectively. Though the lessons are for ESL, the basic format could be easily adapted.

11. USING MOVIES, TELEVISION AND OTHER VIDEO CLIPS TO TEACH GRAMMAR

Summary: Movies, television shows and video clips can provide a rich source of linguistic input for teaching grammar. Like teaching grammar through texts, grammar through video is an inductive approach to teaching and progresses from focus on meaning to focus on form.

Daniela Terenzi (2012) presents the idea of using dialogue scripts from target language films to teach grammar. Following an initial viewing of the film in which

learners engage in meaning comprehension tasks, Terenzi's model has three stages: noticing the grammar feature in the provided script excerpt, using that feature in a meaningful production activity and finally reflecting on the use of the feature. In fact, in Terenzi's model the teacher does not interact at any point in the grammar learning process; students hypothesize the grammar rules, test their hypotheses in production activities, and then edit and revise their own products in a cycle of feedback and reflection that does not include the teacher.

Teachers can modify this model to include more teacher-guided focus on form and explicit rule statement. Also, Terenzi suggests choosing videos with easily understandable plots, and even suggests using familiar American films with foreign language voice dubbing.

Benefits: Videos are fun for students, and can therefore be both motivational and engaging. If the video is from the target culture, it can also serve as a cultural lesson. In addition to these benefits, the aforementioned benefits of inductive teaching also apply here.

Limitations: Finding video excerpts that include repeated use of a specific grammatical structure can be difficult. In addition, authentic films and television may include too much unknown vocabulary or too many advanced grammatical structures for lower level students. Being confronted with incomprehensible language is both unproductive and de-motivating for students, even if some discrete language pieces are comprehensible.

Examples: Terenzi (2012) presents a sample ESL lesson based on Disney's "Madagascar" that can serve as a useful model. Part of the lesson is reproduced with permission in Appendix A.

CONCLUSION

Having a variety of approaches to grammar teaching produces a more responsive, skilled teacher and more engaged, well-rounded students. To that end, this report proposes a "toolbox approach" to grammar teaching by presenting a sampling of potential grammar teaching methods. These methods should be used in conjunction with high amounts of target language input and opportunities for practice and experimentation with the language.

In today's foreign language teaching climate, messages that encourage teachers to create communicative, culturally rich classrooms, like the ACTFL Standards, and curricula that emphasize focus on form, like those outlined in the textbooks discussed in Chapter One, can often seem contradictory. It is my hope that the teaching ideas gathered here will inspire teachers to view grammar teaching as a dynamic and useful element in the modern communicative classroom, one that does not negate or contradict meaningful, culturally authentic language use. Grammar is a tool that can empower students to communicate and comprehend, and should be taught with these goals in mind.

Appendix: Excerpts from Terenzi's (2012) Sample Lesson: Madagascar (slides 8-9, reproduced with permission)

Activity 2 - *Noticing*

Watch the movie scenes, read the movie script. Pay attention to the sentences in bold and then discuss them with your teacher and colleagues.

- Oh my head! Where? What? I'm in the box! Oh no! No no! Not the box! Oh no, **they can't transfer me**! Not me! **I can't breathe**. I can't breathe. Darkness creeping in. **Can't breathe. I can't breathe!** Walls closing in around me! - So alone, so alone

Where is Alex? _____
*What is his problem?*_____
*Why can't he breathe?*_____

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GYDqUA7FIW8&feature=related
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mI66QRspRQY&feature=related

Activity 2 - *Noticing*

SHIP TO KENYA WILDLIFE PRESERVE AFRICA. - Progress report.
It's an older code Skipper, **I can't make it out**.
You, higher mammal. - **Can you read**?
No, **Phil can read though**. Phil! Ship to Kenya. Wildlife preserve Africa!
Africa. That ain't gonna fly. Rico!
What special ability does Phil have?

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8-6J8HWGzkg

Would you excuse me for a moment? Get me out of here! We gotta get out of here!
- Alex! - Help! - What are you doing?
- I'm swimming back to New York! **I know I can't swim, but I have to try!**
- **You can't swim**!
- There are more chances!
Nature! It's all over me! Get it off! **I can't see**! I can't see! I can see!

What does Alex want to do?
Can he swim back to New York? Why?
What is the problem with Melman? Why?
Considering the dialogues you have just studied, what's the meaning of "can"?

Bibliography

ACFTL website. (n.d.). "National Standards for Foreign Language Education." Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3392

Ammar, A., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2010). Awareness of L1/L2 differences: Does it matter? *Language Awareness*, *19*(2), 129–146. doi:10.1080/09658411003746612

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of linguistic knowledge in second language use. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *4*(01), 31–45. doi:10.1017/S0272263100004265

Bialystok, E., & Bouchard Ryan, E. (1985). A metacognitive framework for the development of first and second language skills. In D. Forrest-Pressley, G.E. MacKinnon & T.G. Waller (Eds.), *Metacognition, cognition, and human performance*. Academic Press.

Borg, S. (1998a). Talking about grammar in the foreign language classroom. *Language Awareness*, *7*(4), 159–175. doi:10.1080/09658419808667107

Borg, S. (1998b). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(1), 9–38.

Borg, S. (1999). The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*(1), 95–124. doi:10.1093/applin/20.1.95

Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching oral English*. Longman.

Celani, M. A. A. (1979). Peer teaching as a motivating factor in developing communicative skills. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 197-199.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(3), 459–512.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, *57*(3), 402–423. doi:10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *17*(03), 379–410. doi:10.1017/S027226310001425X

DeKeyser, R. M. (1996). Exploring automatization processes. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(2), 349–357. doi:10.2307/3588151

DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus On Form In Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(1), 39–60. doi:10.2307/3587901

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 83–107. doi:10.2307/40264512

Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(2), 323–351. doi:10.2307/3587436

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(4), 605–628. doi:10.2307/3587079

Guilloteau, N. (2009-2012). Lesson 4: Structured input. *COERLL, Foreign Language Teaching Methods: Vocabulary.* University of Texas-Austin. Retrieved from http://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/vocabulary/04/input.php

Hall, C. (1998). Overcoming the grammar deficit: The role of information technology in teaching German grammar to undergraduates. *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, *55*(1), 41–60. doi:10.3138/cmlr.55.1.41

Harley, B. (1992). Patterns of second language development in French immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *2*(02), 159–183. doi:10.1017/S0959269500001289

Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *The French Review*, *65*(5), 708–718.

Horwitz, E. K. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher: a practical guide to second language learning and teaching*. Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Huang, J. (2010). Grammar instruction for adult english language learners: A task-based learning framework. *Journal of Adult* Education, 39(1), 29-37.

Hulstijn, J, & de Graaf, R. (1994). Under what conditions does explicit knowledge of a second language facilitate the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A research proposal. *AILA Review*, *11*, 97–112.

Humbach, N., Velasco, S. M., & Chiquito, A. B. (2006). *Holt Spanish 1: ¡Expresate!* Holt McDougal.

James, C. (1994). Explaining grammar to its learners. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 203–214). Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London ; New York: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: from grammar to grammaring*. Thomson/Heinle.

Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. McGraw-Hill.

Leech, G. (1994). Students' grammar - Teachers' grammar - Learners' grammar. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 17–30). Prentice Hall.

Lightbown, P. M. (1990). Process-product research on second language learning in classrooms. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins & M. Swain (Eds.), *The Development of Second Language Proficiency* (pp. 82–92). Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. M. (1991). What have we here? Some observations of the effect of instruction on L2 learning. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: a commemorative volume for Claus Faerch* (pp. 197–212). Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R.B. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 37–52). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

McGraw-Hill. (2007). *¡Buen viaje! Level 1, Student Edition* (1st ed.). Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of Second-Language Learning*. Second language acquisition (London, England). London ; Baltimore, Md., U.S.A: E. Arnold.

McLaughlin, B., Rossman, T., & McLeod, B. (1983). Second language learning: An information-processing perspective. *Language Learning*, *33*(2), 135–158. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1983.tb00532.x

Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Heinle & Heinle.

Paesani, K. (2005). Literary texts and grammar instruction: Revisiting the inductive presentation. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*(1), 15–23. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02449.x

Peck, A. (1989). *Language Teachers at Work: A Description of Methods*. Prentice Hall College Div.

Richards, J. C. (2002). Addressing the grammar gap in task work. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 153–166). Cambridge University Press.

Rivera-Mills, S. V., & Plonsky, L. (2007). empowering students with language learning strategies: A critical review of current issues. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*(3), 535–548.

Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second language grammar: learning and teaching*. Longman.

Rutherford, W. E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1988). *Grammar and second language teaching: a book of readings*. Newbury House Publishers.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. doi:10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Scott, V. M., & Fuente, M. J. D. L. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(1), 100–113. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00689.x

Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(4), 395–403. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb05319.x

Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research*, *7*(2), 118–132. doi:10.1177/026765839100700204

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(02), 165–179. doi:10.1017/S0272263100011943

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 760–769. doi:10.2307/3588224

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus On Form In Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge University Press.

Sysoyev, P. (1999). Integrative L2 grammar teaching: Exploration, explanation and expression. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *V*(6). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sysoyev-Integrative.html

Terenzi, D. "Teaching 'Grammar as Skill' Using Movies." (Powerpoint presentation, Texas Foreign Language Education Conference, Austin, TX, March, 2012).

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Longman.

Tonkyn, A. (1994). Introduction: Grammar and the language teacher. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 1–14). Prentice Hall.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(02), 225–243. doi:10.1017/S0272263100011979

VanPatten, B., & Sanz, C. (1995). From input to output: Processing instruction and communicative tasks. In F. Echman, D. Highland, P. Lee, J. Milcham & R. Rutkowski Weber (Eds.), *Second language acquisition: Theory and pedagogy* (pp. 169–186). Psychology Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.